

REMARKS

This amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action dated August 27, 2003. It is a duplicate of the amendment which was filed in response to the Office Action dated March 13, 2003 with the exception that Applicant has corrected claim 1 by including all of the language in the earlier amended claim. In addition, Applicant has changed claim 13 to be identified as "Previously" presented. In all other respects, the amendment is identical to that filed in response to the Office Action mailed March 13, 2003.

The Examiner has objected to claims 1-8 and 13 because of informalities. Appropriate correction is required. Claim 1, line 5, --a-- should be inserted before "guide". Claim 13, line 4, --a-- should be inserted before "linkage".

Based on the Office Action mailed March 13, 2003, the Examiner would allow claim 6 if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 1 has been amended to have all the base claims and any intervening claims. It is now believed to be in proper form for allowance.

Claim 13 has been allowed.

Claims 14-20 are canceled.

New claims are added that overcome the Examiner's rejection of original claim 1 based on 35 U.S.C. § 102/103. New claim 21 requires an elongated knife having a substantially straight cutting edge. There are several differences between the cited Werner reference and claim 21. Werner teaches that the cutting edge should have a concave or a convex cutting edge, whereas the present invention requires the blade to have a substantially straight cutting edge instead of having a convex or a concave one. Werner shows a device which swipes back and forth to make the cut. Werner could not be used to cut a plurality of sheet members in a single

cut like the device of claim 21. Accordingly claim 21, as a result of its straight cutting edge, produces a result not attainable with Werner. The prior art cuts the workpiece by swinging back and forth and by scrubbing the workpiece surfaces. The present invention cuts the object material in a single motion with its substantially straight cutting edges.

Werner also shows a linkage attached to a frame on one of its ends. This attachment is not movable between first and second positions as required by claim 21. The guide mechanism of claim 21 moves along the guide slot to achieve the two cutting actions required by claim 21.

#### CONCLUSION

There are two main differences between prior art and present invention. One is the shape of cutting edge. The prior art shows either a convex or a concave shape of the cutting edge but claim 21 requires a substantially straight one in order to get the desired outcome. A second difference is in the guide mechanism that is movable between first and second positions. So for all those reasons new claim 21 overcomes the previous rejections by the Examiner and accordingly the following claims 22-28 should also be allowable.

No fees or extensions of time are believed to be due in connection with this amendment; however, consider this a request for any extension inadvertently omitted, and charge any additional fees to Deposit Account No. 26-0084.

Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



MICHAEL G. VOORHEES, Reg. No. 25,715  
McKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C.  
801 Grand Avenue, Suite 3200  
Des Moines, Iowa 50309-2721  
Phone No: (515) 288-3667  
Fax No: (515) 288-1338  
CUSTOMER NO: 22885

Attorneys of Record

- bja -